

## Danner, Ward

---

**From:** Wilson, Patrick  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 09, 2014 12:38 PM  
**To:** Jennifer deNicola  
**Subject:** RE: please send me the .2 for schools document  
**Attachments:** DOC015.pdf

[http://www.cleanairinfo.com/energyefficiencytraining/files/nj/2\\_Mark%20Maddaloni/2%20EPA%20School%20PCBs.pdf](http://www.cleanairinfo.com/energyefficiencytraining/files/nj/2_Mark%20Maddaloni/2%20EPA%20School%20PCBs.pdf)

Good Morning Ms. DeNicola (Jennifer),

Thank you for your message - I very much appreciate your patience during our conversation last evening. I wanted to provide a couple of pieces of information to you that I hope is responsive to your request:

1. I've attached a pdf copy (it may be upside down & need to be printed) of a memo prepared by my counterpart in EPA's Region II office in New York which details the derivation & formal recommendation associated with the 0.2 ug/m3 guideline considered protective for airborne PCBs exposures in schools. The memo details the toxicity criteria & exposure assumptions used to arrive at this health-based concentration - which is considered protective for all receptors at the school.

The paragraph with the specific recommendation & health-based concentration can be found on pg.10 of this memo.

2. I am also attaching a link to a powerpoint presentation that my colleague has used in various settings to capture some of the science & analysis supporting the Agency's guidelines. I would like to specifically direct your attention to some of the information captured in slide #5 - which provides some limited data from rooms sampled with differing configurations with respect to ventilation system dynamics (windows & systems).

We hope that you find this information useful Jennifer.

Best Regards...

-----Original Message-----

From: Jennifer deNicola [mailto:jd18@me.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, January 08, 2014 11:30 PM  
To: Wilson, Patrick  
Subject: please send me the .2 for schools document

Dear Patrick,

Thank you for returning my call and for listening. This is such a frustrating experience. I understand that risk assessment is not cut and dry but it is also too flexible. People's lives and the risk associated with toxins is not flexible. To me it is very cut and dry. The less risk that we can expose people to the better it is and that should be our goal.

I understand that your goals are set by congress but this should not be. Since we cannot change that, we can let that rest.

Please keep in mind that PCBs are 1 toxin in a list of toxins found on our school grounds. Whether a particular toxin is causing harm or the mixture of these toxins together is causing harm, we must test the entire campus to ensure all of it is healthy for our kids and our teachers. Until all toxins are tested, no one can scientifically assure us that it is safe.

Please send me the school screening level that you told me about that is .2ug/m3. But understand that the screening level should be at the safest level of .0043 ug/m3 (yes I am using your factors) that is written in your regional screening level table.

Kids should always have the safest protection under the law, which means the safest protection by the EPA. They are our future and in America, our job is to always protect them.

Sincerely,  
Jennifer deNicola